

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Advisory Action dated February 26, 2007 and the Final Office Action dated December 7, 2006. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 9, 15, 16, 21, 25-27, and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added in the amendment to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to the claims and reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Reply to Advisory Action

The Advisory Action stated that "Saito teaches the access allowed to an accessor based on the rights of access which are determined by checking for the authorization information pertaining to the accessor accessing a document or its portion at column 8 lines 11-34." However, claim 1 recites "an expert system, wherein the expert system provides authorization information to the access layer in response to a request." The *Saito* reference does not teach an expert system that provides authorization information to an access layer in response to a request, nor does the Advisory Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Instead, the cited portions of the *Saito* reference teach that the access right setting means directly sets permissions and inhibitions in the document (*Saito*, column 3, lines 4-8; column 7, lines 25-28; column 8, lines 22, 26). Accordingly, claims 1-30 are allowable over the cited art.

Reply to Final Office Action

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 21-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In order to expedite prosecution, and without agreeing with the examiner's position, Applicant has amended claim 21 to replace "information carrier", a term that encompasses a propagated signal, with "machine-readable medium", which does not.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,599,324 issued to Saito et al. ("*Saito*") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,409 issued to Schneck et al. ("*Schneck*").

The *Saito* reference teaches a document management apparatus where a document is accessible by a plurality of persons and suitable access rights are established for the plurality of persons (*Saito*, column 1, line 67-column 2, line 3). The *Saito* reference also teaches that an access right setting means receives access privileges-specific information inputted through a keyboard by an access right manager (*Saito*, column 8, lines 12-15). The described access privileges-specific information includes information for specifying the structured document, information for specifying an accessor (accessor ID), and information indicative of a distinction between permission and inhibition of access for a document element (*Saito*, column 8, lines 15-22).

Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

the expert system provides authorization information to the access layer in response to a request, and wherein the expert system is operable to determine the authorization information comprising an access behavior with regards to the at least one portion.

The *Saito* reference does not teach an expert system that is operable to determine authorization information comprising access behavior with regards to at least one portion of an electronic document and "[to provide] authorization information to an access layer in response to a request," as recited in claim 1. Instead, the *Saito* reference teaches the access right setting means directly sets up permission or inhibition of access rights for each document element of the structured document (*Saito*, column 8, lines 22-26). Thus, the *Saito* reference teaches that the access right setting means directly sets permissions and inhibitions in the document (*Saito*, column 3, lines 4-8; column 7, lines 25-28; column 8, lines 22, 26); whereas the claim recites an expert system that determines authorization information and that provides authorization information to an access layer that controls access to a document.

In addition, the *Schneck* reference does not teach an expert system that provides authorization information to an access layer in response to a request, where the expert system is

operable to determine authorization information with regards to at least one portion of an electronic document. The Examiner failed to cite any portion of the reference as teaching this limitation. Accordingly, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 3. Claim 3 recites that “the expert system returns the access behavior to the access layer to control the access of the accessor.” The *Saito* reference does not teach that an expert system returns access behavior to an access layer to control access of an accessor. Instead, the *Saito* reference teaches the access right setting means directly sets up permission or inhibition of an access right to a document (*Saito*, column 8, lines 22-26). The *Schneck* reference also does not teach an expert system that returns access behavior to an access layer to control access of an accessor nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Accordingly, claim 3 is further allowable over the cited art.

Claim 5. Claim 5 recites that “the access layer utilizes a generic interface implemented by the document to access the document attribute from the document.” The *Saito* reference does not teach an access layer that utilizes a generic interface implemented by a document to access a document attribute of a document from the document nor do the citations in the Office Action teach such limitations. Instead, the *Saito* reference citations in the Office Action teach the structure altered document produced in the structure alteration means is transferred to the display editing unit (*Saito*, column 10, lines 45-47). The *Schneck* reference does not teach an access layer utilizes a generic interface implemented by a document to access a document attribute of a document from the document nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Accordingly, claim 5 is further allowable over the cited art.

Claims 9, 15, and 25. Claims 9 recites that “a framework generates a runtime representation of the document that references the document and restricts the access of the accessor to the document in accordance with the access behavior.” Claims 15 and 25 recite “[generating] a runtime representation of the document that references the document and restricts the access of the accessor to the document in accordance with the access behavior.”

The *Saito* reference and the *Schneck* reference do not teach a runtime representation of the document that references a document and “restricts the access of the accessor to the document in accordance with the access behavior” nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Accordingly, claims 9, 15, and 25 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 16 and 26. Claims 16 and 26 recite “[receiving] an event raised by the document or raised by the runtime representation, where the event is triggered by a change of the document.” The *Saito* reference and the *Schneck* reference do not teach a runtime representation of the document that references a document and “restricts the access of the accessor to the document in accordance with the access behavior” nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Accordingly, claims 16 and 26 are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claims 12 and 21 recite limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claims 1, claims 12 and 21 and their corresponding dependent claims are also allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed concurrently with this Reply to Advisory Action of February 26, 2007 and Final Office Action dated December 7, 2006. Please apply the required \$790 filing fee for the Request for Continued Examination and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050. If an extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 32864
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091